**DOCUMENT RESUME**

ED 167 250 PS 010 396

AUTHOR Holdnak, Mildred Walden
TITLE An Analysis of Campus Child Care Centers in the State-Supported Colleges and Universities of Florida.
PUB DATE Dec 78
NOTE 89p.; Master's Thesis, Florida State University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Child Care Centers; *Colleges; Day Care Services; Early Childhood Education; Financial Support; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Program Content; Questionnaires; Research; *State Surveys; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Florida; Staff Educational Level

ABSTRACT

Objectives of this master's thesis were to analyze the status of existing day care centers at state supported colleges and universities in Florida in terms of purposes, funding, policies and policy making, staffing, program content for children, training experiences offered to college students and benefits of the center to the sponsoring institution. An additional purpose was to identify the attitudes of college and university administrators toward the establishment of campus child care centers in those institutions where centers did not exist. It was hypothesized that there were no significant differences in the existence of a campus child care center in relation to urban or rural locale, level (university or junior college), student body size, and date established. A 33-item questionnaire was directed to the deans of student affairs or their nearest counterparts. The data sample was composed of the representatives of the 42 campuses which responded to the questionnaire. Chi-square analysis was performed. The null hypothesis was not rejected. Tables describe the sample by level and response, summarize the relations of institutional characteristics and centers, indicate type and source of center funding, give the educational level of directors and teachers, outline program content, and present administrators' reasons for not sponsoring a child care center. (Author/RH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED167250

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

# AN ANALYSIS OF CAMPUS CHILD CARE CENTERS IN STATE-SUPPORTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN FLORIDA

BY

MILDRED WALDEN HOLDNAK

A Thesis submitted to the
Department of Home Economics Education
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Approved:

Bonnie B. Greenwood
Professor Directing Thesis

Sally K. Hansen

Don R. Cox

Margaret A. Sutton
Dean, College of Home Economics

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mildred Holdnak

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

December, 1978

PS 010396

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to analyze the status of campus child care centers in the state-supported colleges and universities in Florida. The study sought to determine whether certain institutional characteristics were significantly related to the existence of child care centers. The characteristics considered were: the rural or urban locale; the level (university or junior college); the size of the student body; and the date the institution was established. The status of existing centers was analyzed in terms of purpose, funding, policies and policy making, staffing, program content for children, training opportunities offered to college students, and benefits of the center to the sponsoring institution. Further, the study examined the attitudes of administrators toward campus child care centers on those campuses where no center existed at the time of the study.

The data were obtained from a questionnaire developed by the researcher. The instrument and a cover letter were mailed to the deans of student affairs on the nine university and the 36 junior college campuses in the state-supported system of higher education in Florida. The data producing sample was composed of the deans of student affairs and

child care center directors on the 42 campuses who responded to one or more parts of the questionnaire. Returns were received from all nine of the universities and from 33 of the 36 junior college campuses. The data were collected, analyzed, and tabulated by the investigator using chi-square analysis. The .05 level of significance was used to test the null hypothesis.

## Conclusions

The findings from the study seem to suggest the following conclusions:

1. Child care centers existed on or as an adjunct to 23 (55%) of the 42 campuses responding to the survey.

2. There was no significant relationship between the existence of campus child care centers and the institutional characteristics of locale, level (university or junior college), student body size or date of establishment of the institution.

3. The majority (56%) of the centers perceived their primary purpose to be the provision of a needed service to parents.

4. The majority (56%) of centers were funded by both user fees and financial support/in-kind services received from the sponsoring institution.

5. Two types of child care programs existed on Florida campuses. The majority (60%) of the centers offered full day programs of eight or more hours duration; ten (40%) of the programs were of less than four hours duration and were considered by their directors to be child development centers or laboratory schools.

6. The majority (85%) of the centers maintained operations only during the terms when the college or university was in session.

7. The majority (88%) of the centers accepted only those children who were enrolled on a regular basis.

8. The majority (76%) of the centers did not have a priority system for admission although eligibility for the services varied. Admission was limited to campus related children in nine (36%) centers whereas 16 (64%) accepted both campus related and non-campus related children.

9. Parents were involved in policy making in 17 (68%) of the centers.

10. Staff/child ratios and the educational level of the staffs appeared to be at a satisfactory level.

11. The majority (92%) of the centers offered a wide range of educational and developmental activities for the children.

12. The majority (84%) of the centers were utilized for the training of college students.

13. Campus child care centers benefited the sponsoring institutions by offering training for employment and by making it possible for more students to attend college.

14. The primary reasons for not having a campus child care center, according to college administrators, were lack of funding and lack of suitable space or facilities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Most sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Bonnie Greenwood for her assistance, guidance and encouragement in completing this study. Gratitude is expressed also to Dr. Sally Hansen and Dr. Don Rapp for their constructive suggestions and cooperation as members of my committee. Warmest thanks go to Dr. Michael Hill, Escambia County Child Development Center, for his assistance in completing the statistical portion of the study.

A very special thank you goes to the respondents of this study. Their interest and encouragement supported the belief that there was a need for this information and made the effort of compiling it a very satisfying one.

Warmest thoughts and thanks go to my husband and our children. Their interest, encouragement and support are deeply appreciated. Thanks also to the dear friends who encouraged me to enter graduate school and who maintained an interest in my progress. A very special thank you goes to my mother who taught me by her example that age is never a barrier - only an excuse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT..... ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... v

LIST OF TABLES..... viii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

Need for the Study..... 2
Objectives..... 3
Statement of the Problem..... 3
Hypothesis..... 4
Assumptions..... 4
Limitations..... 5
Delimitations..... 5
Definition of Terms..... 5

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... 7

The Historical Development of the Child Care Movement..... 7
Campus Child Care Centers..... 12
Evaluation of Child Care Centers..... 16

III. PROCEDURE..... 18

Development of the Instrument..... 18
Selection of the Sample..... 19
Administration of the Instrument..... 20
Treatment of the Data..... 20

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA..... 21

Description of the Sample..... 21
The Existence of Centers in Relation to Institutional Characteristics..... 23
The Status of Existing Centers..... 25
Attitudes of University and College Administrators..... 38
Results..... 39

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 41

APPENDICES..... 51

A. State-Supported Colleges and Universities in Florida..... 52

B. Correspondence..... 57

C. Consultants and Pilot Study Institutions..... 63

D. Staff-Child Ratios..... 65

E. Questionnaire..... 67

REFERENCES..... 77

VITA..... 79

## LIST OF TABLES


| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Description of the Sample by Level and Response..... | 22 |
| 2. | Summary of Institutional Characteristics and Campus Child Care Centers..... | 24 |
| 3. | Funding of Campus Child Care Centers..... | 28 |
| 4. | The Educational Level of Directors and Master Teachers of Campus Child Care Centers..... | 33 |
| 5. | Program Content for Children..... | 35 |
| 6. | Reasons for not Sponsoring a Child Care Center as Reported by Campus Administrators..... | 40 |

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

The demand for the creation of additional child care centers is being made throughout the nation by individuals and organizations representing such diverse groups as labor unions, working mothers, educators and students. The inflationary economy, the feminist movement and the increasing incidence of single parent families have contributed to the growing numbers of women either in the labor force or preparing to enter it. Since responsibility for child rearing has traditionally fallen to women in our society, the trend toward dual roles has made it necessary for mothers to seek alternative methods of providing child care.

This century has seen vast strides in the development and promulgation of information concerning children and their needs, particularly in the early years. Freud based much of his psychoanalytic theory on the assumption that personality is well formed by the end of the fifth year and that subsequent growth consists for the most part of elaborating on this basic structure (Hall and Lindzey, 1957). The subsequent works of Erikson, Maslow and Piaget have emphasized the importance of humane relationships and of enriching the environmental experience of the child in

order to promote the senses of identity and trust needed for maximum cognitive development to occur (Gardner, 1973).

There is a need for college and university campus groups to be aware of the wide range in conditions, content and intent of programs labeled day care. Options exist for every facet of a child care program and choices made may determine the success or failure of the program (Page, 1971). The demand for child care centers has extended into the colleges and universities of Florida. Concern about this issue has been expressed by student government associations on several campuses. College newspapers have reflected the interest shown by students (Pensacola Junior College Corsair, 1975, 1977; Florida State University Flambeau, 1970, 1973, 1974). These expressions of concern indicate that students feel there is a need for child care services but they do not describe the quality or extent of care sought.

The purpose of the study was to analyze the status of campus child care centers in the state-supported colleges and universities of Florida. It was anticipated that the study would have implications for institutions considering the establishment of centers on their campuses. An analysis of existing campus child care centers revealed some of the options exercised regarding policies, funding and services and provided information needed by those considering the establishment of a program. It also revealed the attitudes of administrators toward campus day care in those

institutions where centers do not exist at this time.

## Objectives

The objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To identify the state-supported colleges and universities which have campus child care centers.
2. To analyze the status of the existing centers in terms of purpose, funding, policies and policy making, staffing, program content for children, training experiences offered to college students and benefits of the center to the sponsoring institution.
3. To identify the attitudes of college and university administrators toward the establishment of campus child care centers in those institutions where centers do not exist at this time.

## Statement of the Problem

This study explored the status of campus child care centers in the state-supported colleges and universities of Florida. Specifically, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. Which colleges and universities have campus child care centers?
2. What is the primary purpose(s) of the center?
3. How are the centers funded?
4. What are the center's policies regarding admission, types of attendance permitted, food service and hours of operation?
5. Are parents, center staff, college administrators and student groups involved in policy making?
6. How many children can be accomodated in the center, their age range and the staff/child ratio?

7. What is the number and the educational level of the staff?

8. Does the center offer planned educational and developmental experiences for the children?

9. Is the center utilized for observation/training experiences for college students.

10. Are parent education experiences offered in conjunction with the center?

11. How has the center benefited the sponsoring institution?

12. What are the expressed attitudes of college or university administrators regarding the need, feasibility and desirability of establishing child care centers in those institutions where centers do not exist at this time?

## Hypothesis

There are no significant differences in the existence of a campus child care center in relation to the following institutional characteristics:

a. urban or rural locale
b. level (university or junior college)
c. student body size
d. date established

## Assumptions

In carrying out the study, the following assumptions were made:

1. Campus child care centers exist as an adjunct to some college and university campuses in Florida.

2. The primary purpose of a campus child care center may be to serve as a convenience to the parents, as an observation/training setting for college or university students, as a research oriented laboratory for students and faculty or for a combination of these reasons.

3. The expressed attitudes of college and university

administrators toward the establishment of campus child care centers would reflect the official consensus of that institution.

## Limitations

The limitations of the study were the following:

1. The study was limited to information contained in the questionnaire whereas many other factors may exist.

2. The study was limited by a relatively small sample, the twenty-eight community and junior colleges and the nine universities in the state-supported system of higher education in Florida.

3. The study was limited by the time available for administrators and child care center directors to respond completely and accurately to the questionnaire.

## Delimitations

The study was limited to the following:

1. The state-supported junior and community colleges of Florida as listed in the 1976-1977 Directory of Florida Community Colleges and the universities in Florida as listed in the 1976 Handbook of Florida Association of Colleges and Universities.

2. The deans of student affairs in the state-supported colleges and universities and/or any person they so designated to respond to the survey.

3. The status of campus child care centers in Florida as they existed in the 1977-78 school year.

## Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined in order to increase understanding of the study:

1. Colleges: The state-supported two year community and junior colleges of Florida as listed in the

1976-77 Directory of Florida Community Colleges.

2. Universities: The state-supported institutions in Florida offering baccalaureate degrees as listed in the 1976 Handbook of Florida Association of Colleges and Universities.

3. College and University Administrators: For purposes of the study, college and university administrators surveyed were the Dean of Student Affairs as listed in the previously cited handbook and directory. Where no such position was listed, the nearest counterpart was surveyed.

4. Child Care Center: "A place to provide good care and protection on a regular basis for children, outside their homes for part or all of a day ...for four or more hours each day" (Florida Department of Education, 1971, p.45).

5. Campus Child Care Center: A child care center, day care center, nursery school, laboratory school or co-op child care center located on or adjunct to the campus of a college or university and funded wholly or in part by the institution or its students.

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature significant to this study has been organized into three areas: the historical development of the child care movement, campus child care centers, and the evaluation of child care centers.

### The Historical Development of the Child Care Movement

The child care movement had its roots in nineteenth century Europe where the first institution for children of working mothers was founded in Germany in 1802. By the end of the century, a limited number of infant schools, nursery schools and "creches" had been established in the United States and most of the major countries of Europe (Hildebrand, 1971).

The belief that the child's mind, body and senses could be developed through arranged play is credited to Friedrich Froebel, a German philosopher who coined the term "kindergarten" for the school he opened in 1837. Maria Montessorri followed later with an educational system designed to promote independence and self-help by following a sequential series of tasks (Hildebrand, 1971).

In 1911, the Yale Psycho- Clinic began operations to study mental development in young children under the direction of Dr. Arnold Gesell. In the mid-twenties Gesell established a "guidance nursery" where young children came for observation and testing. The Iowa Child Welfare Research Station and the Merrill-Palmer nursery school followed soon afterward. By the mid-thirties, nursery schools or laboratory schools had developed in most of the major colleges and universities in the United States (Frank, 1962). These early centers were research oriented, established primarily to learn more about how children grow and develop, how they learn and become personalities and how they may become warped and stunted in the early years (Frank, 1962).

Research and observation throughout the world revealed a wealth of knowledge of the developmental needs of young children and the critical importance of the early years. Earlier, Sigmund Freud had made the assumption that the personality of the individual was generally formed by the end of the fifth year and that subsequent growth consisted of elaborating on that basic structure (Hall and Lindzey, 1957).

Subsequent studies of early childhood have taken varied approaches. Gesell observed the activities of large numbers of children and developed "norms" or descriptions of behavior that could be expected of a child at each age level (Gardner, 1973). Erikson outlined stages in the

development of personality and emphasized the importance of people in the environment in determining whether the child would develop the trust that would lead to a sense of trustworthiness and a satisfying self-concept (Stewart, 1974).

Piaget was concerned with the mental operations by which a child knows and understands his world. His belief was that a child learns by assimilating information from his surroundings and that the baby who has nothing to work with because of a restricted and deprived environment will not have the same opportunity for cognitive development as the baby in an enriched environment (Stewart, 1974).

Theorists tend to agree that the surroundings and relationships in the early years are crucial to the development of self-concept, personality and cognitive development in the individual. The growth of child care centers in the United States, however, has more often been a response to economic and sociological problems than a reflection of concern for its children. Winston Potter stated:

> The world's most important resource, our children, is seldom mentioned with the same urgency as our other endangered resources: fuel, air, water, and forests. Yet they bring to society their intelligence, their talents, their willingness. This spiritual wealth is as crucial to conserve as physical resources. From their ranks, the leadership of the community must come (Potter, 1972, p.2).

It was the depression and World War II which brought about the first mass expansion of child care facilities in the United States. The establishment of WPA operated day nurseries helped to provide employment during the

depression. The entrance of vast numbers of women into the work force during World War II brought additional needs for day care and the government responded with the expansion of facilities. After the war, however, the government gradually withdrew from the operation of child care centers leaving the field primarily in the hands of private operators and those colleges and universities who continued to maintain centers for purposes of research and teacher training (Hildebrand, 1972).

The era of the 1960's marked a renewed interest in early childhood. The "War on Poverty" provided impetus for the establishment of the Head Start program and federally funded child care centers for disadvantaged children. These programs were designed with two purposes in mind. The first was to provide enriched developmental and educational experiences for the child in the hope that these would enable him to compete sucessfully in school and in later life. In addition, it was hoped that the provision of child care would enable low income mothers to work or train for work thus enabling them to break out of the welfare cycle (Young and Nelson, 1973).

By the seventies, the need for qualified persons to staff these centers was critical (Brown and Bige, 1972). Universities began to expand their teacher training programs and the movement to provide trained staffs extended into the junior and community colleges. While some universities continue to maintain excellent developmental centers for

research, much of the emphasis has shifted to teacher training.

Many of the two year institutions offer courses which may be transferred to an upper-level university for the degree-seeking student or serve as a terminal program for a well trained para-professional (Conger, 1973). In addition, some colleges and universities are instituting programs designed to up-grade the performance of day care workers. On-the-job training combined with course work is often more practical for the person already employed. The competency-based Child Development Associate program and Field Centered Course program are being advocated as a means of meeting the needs of the non degree-seeking child care worker (Lehane and Goldman, 1976).

Some universities and colleges maintain child development centers to provide opportunities for observation and training experiences needed by those enrolled in child development or early childhood education programs (Brown and Bige, 1972). Others take a multi-disciplinary approach and involve departments of psychology, social welfare and health, leisure and recreation as well as the traditional home economics and education majors (Christensen, 1977). In a survey of pre-kindergarten programs at institutions of higher education, conducted in 1971, it was found that home economics departments administered almost 40% of the total number of programs found in the institutions surveyed (Greenblatt and Eberhard, 1973, p.25).

## Campus Child Care Centers

The National Goals and Guidelines for Research in Home Economics has suggested the need for additional study in the area of day care programs for pre-school children. Two aspects in particular relate to the scope of this study:

1. Extent to which the needs of families are being met in the provision of day care facilities for pre-school children.
2. Evaluation of current program approaches to day care for pre-school children with emphasis on the developmental needs of the child (National Goals and Guidelines for Research in Home Economics, 1970, p.55).

Multiple factors have led to the growth of the child care movement and the demand for expanded services. The women's rights movement, educational research, urban planning and welfare reform were among those cited by the Journal of Home Economics (January, 1972). Young and Nelson (1973) echoed this theme which they termed the "three W's"- working mothers, women's liberation and welfare.

The call for child care centers has been heard on college campuses as well. Potter (1972) noted "...students are turning their concerns to sociology and race relations and child care programs" (p.2). A 1971 survey of 310 senior coeducational colleges and universities found that 100 institutions were operating 90 child care centers (Greenblatt, 1973).

The California State University and College System has centers on almost all of its campuses and others are

expected to open soon. Some are totally student operated, others have working arrangements through the University (Cargill, 1977).

Campuses in Florida have taken note of the day care trend. The Florida State University Flambeau reflected this interest. The June 24, 1970 issue described the opening of an SGA sponsored center to accomodate 15-30 children of non-academic staff. In 1973, a Student's and Parent's Child Care Center was in operation. The issue of June 28, 1974 described a parent's co-op center (FSU Flambeau, 1970, 1973, 1974).

In November, 1974, Florida State University President Stanley Marshall appointed a task force composed of twelve faculty members to "study the child care needs of the University's students, faculty and staff, and to investigate the feasibility of meeting these needs...." (Brudenell, 1975, p.1). The final report, issued in June, 1975, made two recommendations: (1) that Florida State University as a body of persons acknowledge a responsibility for child care as one of the obstacles to education, employment and leisure activity and (2) that Florida State University take direct action to inform new and current Florida State University students and employees of available child care services. Two additional recommendations for the future called for (1) an alliance of businesses and institutions for the purpose of providing access to available child care as well as providing child care to complement that which is

available and (2) establish a model child care center in cooperation with the Community Coordinated Child Care Council and the Child Care Coalition (Brudenell, 1975, pp.5-7).

Interest in the development of a child care center on the campus of Pensacola Junior College is shown in the minutes of the Student Senate of February 17, 1971, November 19, 1975, February 18, 1976, March 24, 1976 and March 31, 1976. In the fall of 1975, a vote by students on the day care issue showed 382 votes in favor and 202 against. The Pensacola Junior College Corsair issues of September 27, 1972, October 18, 1972, March 6, 1975 and June 2, 1977 had articles citing the need for a day care center on campus (Corsair, 1972, 1975, 1977). On February 26, 1976 Jeff Hill, President of the Student Government Association filed a written request with the administration for the planned allotment of physical space to be used for a day care center (Hill, 1976).

Teachers and students alike have voiced concern over the number of children brought to classes by parents. Other reasons cited by students as need for a day care center include convenience to parents, the cost of care in privately operated centers, the establishment of quality child care and the convenience to college students for observation and training in conjunction with child development classes (Corsair, 1972, 1977).

Additional benefits from campus child care centers may be derived if faculty and staff are permitted to use the

center. According to the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor (1972), companies that provide day care facilities for their employees' children have found that absenteeism is reduced and productivity is increased.

Another aspect to be considered is that of parenting education. Student families who feel the loss of the support system offered by the extended family may welcome an opportunity to learn about child development and guidance. Such a program is offered at the Infant and Child Care Center established at Kansas State University (McCord, 1973).

The revised policies of the Florida Board of Regents concerning day care centers state:

3.7.1 Day Care Centers (Revised by BOR 9/7/74)

A. The establishment of day care centers for children of students, staff and faculty is within the scope of the university.

B. Monies appropriated in the general revenue or incidental income funds shall not be used to staff and operate day care centers. Operations may be financed either through activity and service fee allocations, user charges, grants and donations, or any combination of these sources.

C. University facilities necessary for the accomplishment of the university's academic mission may be used for day care centers only if a minimal rental is charged. Such centers will not generate a requirement for fixed capital outlay.

D. Day care center operations that are designed to be integral parts of university research and training activities constitute new academic programs and require prior authorization of the Board of Regents (Florida Board of Regents, 1974).

Florida's Division of Community Colleges has not taken

an official position in support of or in opposition to the development of day care centers on community college campuses. Each community college's board of trustees is responsible for determining whether or not the need for a day care center exists (Raepple, 1977).

## Evaluation of Child Care Centers

Concern has been expressed that the rush to provide child care centers now will result in low quality programs that could be a threat to future development of innovative and developmental centers. Groups involved in the establishment of centers need to examine all aspects of operation and policies to insure that the quality of care will be optimal for the child as well as a fringe benefit for the parent (Page, 1971).

Difficulty arises in defining quality care. Evaluation has traditionally been done by measurement of the cognitive growth of the child. More recently, recognition is being given to the need for the child to be healthy and happy, as well (Community Coordinated Child Care of Tallahassee, Florida, not dated). In summarizing the results of his 1971 survey of campus child care programs, Greenblatt stated: "The ratio of the number of children per adult is generally recognized as an important clue to the quality of the programs" (Greenblatt and Eberhard, 1973).

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (1974) stated: "A good early childhood program

provides needed care, protection and continuous developmental experiences while children are away from their parents". Physical conditions, equipment and play materials, opportunities for creative expression, language, social and emotional development are all components of a quality program. Staff/child ratio, the training of staff, and the caring attitudes of staff toward children are to be considered. Parents need to be involved in the policy and decision making so that the child care will supplement rather than replace that of the parent.

## Summary

There is agreement that the early childhood years are critical to the adjustment and future well being of the individual. Child care centers are playing an increasingly important role in supplementing parental care during the pre-school years. Colleges and universities have traditionally been a part of the child care movement both as research oriented programs and for the purpose of teacher training. There are indications that the trend toward campus child care facilities will continue to expand. Consideration needs to be given to the development of quality programs that will benefit the child as well as the parent and the institution.

# CHAPTER III

## PROCEDURE

The purpose of the study was to analyze the status of campus child care centers in the state-supported colleges and universities of Florida. The procedure for the study will be discussed in the following order: (a) development of the instrument; (b) selection of the sample; (c) administration of the instrument; and (d) treatment of the data.

### Development of the Instrument

A questionnaire was developed for obtaining the necessary data. The form "Day Care Survey" prepared by the Women's Center, National Student Association in cooperation with the Child Welfare League of America, Inc., was used as a guide. To insure validity, consultants knowledgable in the areas covered by the questionnaire were asked to aid in its preparation.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts: (a) descriptive information including name, location, level (university or junior college) and enrollment in each institution, and the existence of a child care center either on or adjunct to the campus; (b) information regarding

the operation of existing centers in terms of purpose, funding, policies and policy making, staffing, program content for children, training experiences offered to college students and benefits of the center to the institution; and (c) attitudes of administrators on campuses with no center in regard to the need, feasibility, desirability and space available for the establishment of centers.

A pilot study of the instrument was conducted using two universities and three junior colleges in the state of Alabama. Only state-supported institutions were asked to participate. Responses were received from the three junior colleges and one university. Two of the institutions completed parts A and B, indicating that centers were in existence on those campuses; two completed parts A and C, indicating that centers did not exist on those campuses at the time of the study. Responses were analyzed and the questionnaire was found to acceptable for use.

## Selection of the Sample

The sample included the nine state-supported universities in Florida listed in the 1976 Handbook on Florida Colleges and Universities and the twenty-eight colleges listed in the 1976-77 Directory of Florida Community Colleges. Questionnaires were directed to the deans of student affairs listed in the above volumes or to their nearest counterpart. Two of the colleges listed a dean of student affairs on each of four branch campuses and one

listed the position on each of three branch campuses. Each of the campuses listing such a position was surveyed. There were 36 college campuses and nine universities bringing the total number of the invited sample to 45 institutions. A list of the institutions is provided in Appendix A.

## Administration of the Instrument

The questionnaire with a cover letter was mailed to the deans of student affairs or their nearest counterparts in each of the Florida institutions. They were requested to respond within two weeks. Three weeks later, follow-up letters were sent to the twelve institutions that had not responded to the initial survey. A second follow-up letter with another copy of the questionnaire was sent to five of the institutions two weeks later.

## Treatment of the Data

The data were collected, analyzed and tabulated by the investigator. Results of the survey were presented with the use of tables where appropriate. Chi-square analysis was used. The .05 level of significance and beyond was used to test the null hypothesis.

# CHAPTER IV

## ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of the study was to analyze the status of campus child care centers in the state-supported colleges and universities of Florida. The questionnaire was developed based on the "Day Care Survey" prepared by the Women's Center, National Student Association in cooperation with the Child Welfare League of America, Inc. Questionnaires were mailed to the deans of student affairs or their nearest counterparts on the 45 campuses in the state-supported system of higher education.

### Description of the Sample

One or more parts of the questionnaire were returned by 42 (93%) of the 45 campuses surveyed. Parts A and C were completed by 19 (45%) campuses indicating that no center existed on those campuses at the time of the survey. Responses to part A stated that child care did exist on 23 (55%) of the campuses. Two campus child care centers did not return part B reducing the data producing sample for part B to 21 (50%) of the total sample. A description of the sample by level and response is given in Table 1.

TABLE 1

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE BY LEVEL AND RESPONSE

| Response | Part A | | Part B | | Part C | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Level | | | | | | |
| University Campus | 9 | 21 | 6 | 14 | 2 | 5 |
| Junior College Campus | 33 | 79 | 15 | 36 | 17 | 40 |
| Total | 42 | 100 | 21 | 50 | 19 | 45 |

## The Existence of Centers in Relation to Institutional Characteristics

In accordance with the hypothesis, the existence of campus child care centers was analyzed in relation to certain institutional characteristics of the sponsoring campus. Four characteristics were considered: urban or rural locale, level (university or junior college), size of the student body and the date the institution was established. Data relating to these characteristics and the existence of campus child care centers are provided in Table 2. No significant differences were found at the .05 level or beyond.

### Locale

Designation of a locale as urban or rural was determined by the population of the community given as the mailing address of the campus. For the study, communities with populations of less than 25,000 were designated rural; those 25,000 or larger were considered urban. Child care centers were found to exist on or as an adjunct to 15 (62%) of the 24 urban campuses and eight (44%) of the 18 rural campuses.

### Level

Child care centers were reported to exist in relation to seven (77%) of the nine universities and 16 (48%) of the 33 junior college campuses in the state-supported system of higher education in Florida.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND CAMPUS CHILD CARE CENTERS

| Institutional Characteristics | Chi-Square | Campuses with Child Care | | Campuses with No Child Care | | Total Campuses Reporting | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Locale | 1.34 | | | | | | |
| Urban | | 15 | 36 | 9 | 21 | 24 | 57 |
| Rural | | 8 | 19 | 10 | 24 | 18 | 43 |
| Level | 2.44 | | | | | | |
| Jr. College | | 16 | 38 | 17 | 40 | 33 | 78 |
| University | | 7 | 17 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 22 |
| Student Body Size | .504 | | | | | | |
| 0-4999 FTEs | | 12 | 29 | 12 | 29 | 24 | 58 |
| 5000 or more FTEs | | 11 | 26 | 7 | 16 | 18 | 42 |
| Date of Establishment | .504 | | | | | | |
| Prior to 1958 | | 5 | 12 | 6 | 14 | 11 | 26 |
| 1958-1978 | | 18 | 43 | 13 | 31 | 31 | 74 |

N=42

* Level of significance =.05

Student Body Size

For purposes of the study, the size of the student body was defined as the number of full-time equivalent students reported in part A of the questionnaire. In analyzing data campuses were designated as those with 0-4,999 FTEs and those with 5,000 or more FTEs. Child care centers were found to exist on twelve (50%) of the 24 campuses with student bodies of less than 5,000 FTEs and on eleven (61%) of the 18 campuses with 5,000 or more FTEs.

Date of Establishment

The date of establishment of each institution was obtained from appropriate directories and college catalogs. For data analysis, institutions were grouped into those established prior to 1958 and those established since 1958. It was learned that 31 of the colleges and universities were established in the period 1958-78 and that child care centers exist in relation to 18 (58%) of them. Campus child care centers were reported to be affiliated with five (45%) of the eleven campuses of institutions founded prior to 1958.

## The Status of Existing Centers

The status of centers was analyzed in terms of purpose, funding, policies and policy making, staffing, program content for children, training experiences offered to college students and benefits of the center to the sponsoring institution. Data were obtained from the 21 returns of

part B of the questionnaire which were completed by directors of the campus child care centers. One college reported a system of seven centers affiliated with the three campuses of the institution. Each center was treated as a respondent bringing the data producing sample for part B to a total of 25. Locations of centers were 15 (60%) on-campus; ten (40%) off-campus. Thirteen (52%) of the centers had been in operation from six to ten years. Twelve (48%) had begun service within the last five years.

Purpose

Service to parents was indicated as the primary purpose for the existence of 14 (56%) of the centers. In four (16%) of the centers, service to parents and opportunities for observation and training of college students ranked equally as primary purposes. Three (12%) of the respondents noted that all three purposes (service to parents, observation and training, and a research oriented laboratory) were of equal importance as reasons for the center to exist. One (4%) center ranked serving as a research oriented laboratory as its primary purpose and three (12%) ranked opportunities for observation and training of college students as most important.

Funding

Analysis of data revealed three classifications of funding for campus child care centers: financial support and/or in-kind services received from the sponsoring institution; user fees; and financial support from non-campus

related sources including United Way, Title XX Federal and state funds and the USDA reimbursed Child Care Food Program. A summary of the types and sources of funding and the frequency of use is given in Table 3. Responses indicated that the majority (56%) of the centers were supported by both user fees and financial support/in-kind services received from the sponsoring institution. Utilization of all three types of funding was reported by seven (28%) of the centers while four (16%) were found to be supported totally by the sponsoring college or university.

Replies from eight (32%) centers included fee schedules. Four of the centers reported charging flat rates for all children. These ranged from $15 per semester per child to $1 per hour per child. Sliding scales from two centers were based on family income and size. The scale of one center ranged from $.60 to $12 per week per child and the second ranged from $7.50 to $25 per week per child. Another center reported fees based on the block of hours attended and the meals or supplements served during those time blocks. A reduced fee for additional children from the same family was offered by one center.

Policies and Policy Making

Certain policies relating to the operation of the centers were examined in the study. The policies considered were: times of operation, types of attendance allowed, and admission.

Data analysis revealed two types of campus child care

TABLE 3

FUNDING OF CAMPUS CHILD CARE CENTERS

| Type and Source of Funding | Sample N | Sample % |
|---|---|---|
| College or University Financial Support | | |
| Student activity fees | 8 | 32 |
| Departmental budgets | 7 | 28 |
| Direct appropriations | 9 | 36 |
| College or University In-kind Services | | |
| Space, free of charge | 20 | 80 |
| Space, minimal rent | 3 | 12 |
| Utilities | 20 | 80 |
| Janitorial service | 20 | 80 |
| Maintenance | 21 | 84 |
| Furnishings/equipment | 20 | 80 |
| Consumable supplies | 17 | 68 |
| Staff salaries | 17 | 68 |
| Student staff salaries | 10 | 40 |
| Professional assistance and consultation | 17 | 68 |
| AV equipment/materials | 2 | 8 |
| Transportation (field trips) | 3 | 12 |
| Use of other facilities (pool, gym, library, etc.) | 2 | 8 |
| Liability and/or fire insurance | 15 | 60 |
| User Fees | 19 | 76 |
| Non-Campus Related Financial Support | | |
| Title XX | 3 | 12 |
| USDA Food Service | 4 | 16 |
| United Way | 3 | 12 |
| Other donations | 3 | 12 |

N=25

centers. Programs of at least eight hours per day were offered by 15 (60%) of the centers. Three of the 15 extended hours into the evening to accomodate student parents enrolled in night classes and one provided before school care for school age children. One center offered a full day program but limited service to three days per week. Programs of less than four hours per day were reported by ten (40%) of the centers. Each of the respondents reporting part-day programs stated that they considered the program to be a laboratory school or child development center. For the study, all programs reported were treated as campus child care centers. It was found that four (16%) of the centers maintained operation on a year round basis while 21 (85%) were open only during those times that the college or university was in session. One center reported operating during the fall and winter terms only; three were closed during the summer.

Types of attendance reported included enrollment on a regular basis, drop-in care and programs for school age children who were enrolled on a regular basis. All ten of the part-day programs limited attendance to those regularly enrolled; four of the full day programs accepted only those regularly enrolled for a full day while eight of them accepted children enrolled on a regular basis for a full or a part-day. Three (12%) of the centers allowed drop-in care in addition to regular attendance and these same three centers also provided some before school, after school and

summer programs for school age children.

It was learned that no priority for admission existed in 19 (76%) of the campus centers although eligibility for the service varied. Two (8%) of the centers accepted only the children of faculty, full and part-time students; five (20%) limited eligibility to children of full and part-time students; and 12 (48%) accepted all children on a first come, first served basis. In the six (24%) centers reporting a priority system, top priority was given to children of full-time students. One (4%) accepted only children of full-time students; one (4%) accepted only college related children; and four (16%) admitted all children while giving top priority to those of full-time students.

The age of the child was found to be one of the criteria considered in admission policies. Infants under two were accepted in one administrative system of seven centers (28%) sponsored by one institution. The minimum age for admission was reported to be two years in six (24%) of the centers; two and a half (or potty-trained) in five (20%) centers; and three years in seven (28%) of the centers. The maximum age for those accepted for the regular program was evenly divided between five years (44%) and six years (44%) of age in 22 of the centers. Three (12%) centers accepted children through age 12 for before school, after school and/or summer programs.

Policy making bodies of varied composition were found to exist in 24 (96%) of the campus child care center

situations whereas one (4%) center reported that policies were made by the administration of the college. Parents were involved in policy making in 17 (68%) of the centers; center staffs in 14 (56%); college faculty members in eight (32%); and student government associations in five (20%). Advisory boards or councils were organized in nine (36%) of the centers. One campus reported including a member of the college board of trustees, one had representatives from the community and one had representatives from the student health services serving on their advisory boards or councils.

Staffing

Staffing patterns in campus child care centers were found to vary in composition. One (4%) center used only permanent paid staffing whereas 24(96%) combined permanent paid staff with students in training (80%) and/or paid work-study students (48%). Parents were involved as volunteers or in co-op arrangements in ten (40%) of the centers. Other volunteers from the campus and/or the community were used in six (24%) centers and six (24%) centers had employees funded under the provisions of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA).

A comparison of the number of staff and the number of children reported from each center suggested that all of the centers maintained staff/child ratios within the guidelines set by the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. Data revealed that the majority (56%) of the

centers were licensed by either their county health department or by the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. Eleven centers (44%), nine of which operated for less than four hours each day, were not licensed. One (4%) center did not respond to the question.

Centers reported both the maximum number of children that could be accomodated at one time and the number of different children served in an average week. A maximum capacity ranging from 15 to 25 children was reported by eight (32%) of the centers; 16 (64%) reported capacities ranging from 26 to 50 children, and one (4%) could serve 90 children at any given time. Variances in attendance patterns and drop-in care accounted for six (24%) centers reporting that they served more different children in an average week than the maximum capacity at any one time.

All (100%) centers reported one or more full-time (for the period of program operation) paid staff plus one or more students, volunteers, parents and/or part-time staff. In seven (28%) centers, the director or master teacher also served the college or university as an instructor or as a trainer of college students.

The highest level of education attained by the directors and master teachers is given in Table 4. Post-graduate degrees were held by one or more staff members in 20 (80%) of the centers. Two (8%) centers reported having no staff member with a college degree although the directors of those centers were high school graduates and one had some

TABLE 4

THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF DIRECTORS AND MASTER TEACHERS OF CAMPUS CHILD CARE CENTERS

| Highest Level of Education Achieved | Directors N | Directors % | Master Teachers N | Master Teachers % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Post-graduate degree | 19 | 76 | 11 | 44 |
| Baccalaureate degree | 4 | 16 | 8 | 32 |
| Some college | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| High School Graduate | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Position not reported | 1 | 4 | 5 | 20 |

N=25

college credits.

Program Content

Two aspects of program content were studied: the activities for children that were included as a regular part of the curriculum and the services that were offered in conjunction with center attendance. In addition to the activities and services listed, the questionnaire provided an open option. It was recognized that the duration of the program and the needs of the children could result in variances of services and activities offered in full day programs and those of four hours or less. For this portion of the study, data from the two types of programs were studied independently and collectively. Data relating to program content and services are provided in Table 5.

Little difference was noted between full day and part-day programs in curriculum. Five of the activities listed were offered in ten (100%) of the part-day programs and 14 (93%) of the full day programs. Two other activities, creative art activities and field trips, were also offered by ten (100%) of the part-day and 13 (86%) of the full day programs. A difference was noted in the physical activities. Swimming was offered by seven (70%) of the part-day and one (6%) of the full day programs whereas gymnastics/ tumbling was reported in two (20%) of the part-day and eleven (73%) of the full day programs. It was recognized that other factors such as the age of the children and the availability of facilities could influence the inclusion

TABLE 5

PROGRAM CONTENT FOR CHILDREN

| Variable | Half-day Programs N=10 | | Full-day Programs N=15 | | All Programs N=25 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| **Activities** | | | | | | |
| Learning centers | 10 | 100 | 14 | 93 | 24 | 96 |
| Block play | 10 | 100 | 14 | 93 | 24 | 96 |
| Creative art | 10 | 100 | 13 | 86 | 23 | 92 |
| Music | 10 | 100 | 14 | 93 | 24 | 96 |
| Language arts | 10 | 100 | 14 | 93 | 24 | 96 |
| Science/nature | 10 | 100 | 14 | 93 | 24 | 96 |
| Swimming | 7 | 70 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 32 |
| Field trips | 10 | 100 | 13 | 86 | 13 | 92 |
| Gymnastics/ Tumbling | 2 | 20 | 11 | 73 | 13 | 52 |
| None of the above | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4 |
| **Services** | | | | | | |
| Breakfasts | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 3 | 12 |
| Supplements | 0 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 4 | 16 |
| Hot lunch | 0 | 0 | 6 | 40 | 6 | 24 |
| Naps | 0 | 0 | 15 | 100 | 15 | 60 |
| Health screening/care | 8 | 80 | 7 | 46 | 15 | 60 |
| Dental screening/care | 1 | 10 | 2 | 13 | 3 | 12 |
| Speech/hearing screening | 8 | 80 | 7 | 46 | 15 | 60 |
| Eye screening | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 4 |
| Parenting opportunities | 9 | 90 | 10 | 67 | 19 | 76 |

of swimming and gymnastics/tumbling in the curriculum. One center utilized the open option to explain that all of the activities marked were included in a Montessori-oriented curriculum. One (4%) center indicated that none of the activities listed were offered in the center nor were others given in the open option.

Differences were noted between the services offered in conjunction with full day and part-day programs. None of the part-day programs included meals, supplements or naps. All (100%) of the full day programs included naps; three (20%) offered breakfast; four (26%) offered supplements; and six (40%) offered a hot lunch. Health screening/care, dental screening/care and speech-hearing screening were offered by both full and part-day programs. Classes or opportunities for parents of children in the center to develop parenting skills were offered by a total of 19 (76%) of the centers.

Training Experiences

Data revealed that campus child care centers exist in complementary roles with sponsoring colleges and universities. Interns and students in training were reportedly used to supplement paid staffing in 21 (84%) of the centers. Opportunities for earning income while students were in training were offered by the 12 (48%) centers who reported student paid staffing and college work-study students. The opportunity to train students for employment was cited as a benefit to the sponsoring institution by 12(48%) of the

responding child care centers.

Benefits of the Center

In reply to an open-ended question, respondents stated the ways in which they felt the center had benefited the college or university. The investigator grouped responses as benefits to the institution and benefits to the student family although it is recognized that they overlap. Twelve (48%) of the replies stated that the center's greatest benefit was the opportunities provided to train students for employment. Two (8%) added that the center had united the total institution in a common endeavor cutting across departmental lines. One (4%) stated that the grade point averages of 75% of the student parents had shown improvement. Eleven (44%) of the responses stated that the greatest value of the center was that it permitted more students to attend college, benefiting both the institution and the individuals involved. Nine (36%) felt that the center had contributed to improved family relations and to greater stability among student families. Seven (29%) of the respondents saw the financial service to parents as a significant benefit. Providing quality child care to the children was felt to be the greatest value of the center by four (16%) of the respondents.

A second open-ended question asked respondents what they had found to be the most difficult part of operating a campus child care center. Staffing problems were listed by ten (40%) of the respondents. Replies included the

problems found in maintaining quality personnel on a part-time basis in centers offering a part-day program and the difficulty of developing consistent work habits in student personnel. Obtaining adequate funding was reported as the major difficulty for seven (28%) of the operators. Two (8%) others specified that "red tape" and the lack of flexibility in the center-college business relationship made management difficult. Being unable to serve the number of children needing and requesting admission was the major difficulty reported by three (12%) of the respondents. One (4%) reply stated that the off-campus location was a problem and one (4%) respondent found her greatest difficulty to be in serving as both center instructor and as a classroom instructor.

Attitudes of University and College Administrators

Data relating to the attitudes of administrators toward campus child care centers on those campuses with no center were obtained from returns of part C of the questionnaire. Responses indicated that 19 (45%) of the 42 campuses did not sponsor a center at the time of the survey. There were plans to establish centers on three campuses; nine were undecided; and seven had no plans for a center within the foreseeable future.

Administrators on 14 campuses reported that courses were offered which might utilize a center for observation, training or research by students and faculty. Needs

assessments and/or feasibility studies had been conducted on eight campuses. Reasons for not sponsoring a center are provided in Table 6. No dominant reason was indicated in the options checked in fourteen (74%) of the replies. Among the responses given as the dominant reason, two (11%) cited lack of funding, two (11%) stated that no need had been indicated, and one (5%) indicated that lack of space/ facilities was the reason. One respondent utilized the open option to explain that an adjacent center operated by another institution was available for use by the students from his campus. None of the replies indicated that lack of approval by trustees or governing boards had been a factor in the decisions relating to campus child care.

## Results

The following null hypothesis was not rejected after Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences at or beyond the .05 level:

> There are no significant differences in the existence of a campus child care center in relation to the following institutional characteristics:
>
> a. urban or rural locale
> b. level (university or junior college)
> c. student body size
> d. date established

TABLE 6

REASONS FOR NOT SPONSORING A CHILD CARE CENTER
AS REPORTED BY CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS

| Reasons | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| No funds available | 16 | 84 |
| No space/facilities available | 14 | 74 |
| Concern for liability | 8 | 42 |
| Investigation of pros and cons not completed | 7 | 37 |
| No need indicated by students or faculty | 5 | 26 |
| Do not want to compete with private operators | 3 | 16 |
| Trustees/governing bodies do not approve | 0 | 0 |

N=19

# CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the study was to analyze the status of campus child care centers in the state-supported colleges and universities of Florida. The study sought to determine whether certain institutional characteristics were significantly related to the existence of child care centers. The characteristics considered were: the rural or urban locale; the level (university or junior college); the size of the student body; and the date the institution was established. The status of existing centers was analyzed in terms of purpose, funding, policies and policy making, staffing, program content for children, training opportunities offered to college students, and benefits of the center to the sponsoring institution. Further, the study examined the attitudes of administrators toward campus child care centers on those campuses where no center existed at the time of the study.

The data were obtained from a questionnaire developed by the researcher. The instrument and a cover letter were mailed to the Deans of Student Affairs on the nine

university and the 36 junior college campuses in the state-supported system of higher education in Florida. The data producing sample was composed of the representatives of the 42 campuses who responded to one or more parts of the questionnaire. Returns were received from all nine of the universities and 33 of the 36 junior college campuses. The data were collected, analyzed, and tabulated by the investigator using chi-square analysis. The .05 level of significance was used to test the null hypothesis.

## Conclusions

The findings from the study as reported in Chapter IV seem to suggest the following conclusions:

1. Child care centers existed on or as adjunct to 23 (55%) of the 42 campuses responding to the survey.

2. There was no significant relationship between the existence of campus child care centers and the institutional characteristics of locale, level (university or junior college), student body size or date of establishment of the institution.

3. The majority (56%) of the centers perceived their primary purpose to be the provision of a needed service to parents.

4. The majority (56%) of centers were funded by both user fees and financial support/in-kind services from the sponsoring institution.

5. Two types of child care programs existed on Florida campuses. The majority (60%) of the centers offered full day programs of eight or more hours duration; ten (40%) of the programs were of less than four hours duration and were considered by their directors to be child development centers or laboratory schools.

6. The majority (85%) of the centers maintained operations only during the terms when the

college or university was in session.

7. The majority (88%) of the centers accepted only those children who were enrolled on a regular basis.

8. The majority (76%) of the centers did not have a priority system for admission although eligibility for the services varied. Admission was limited to campus related children in nine (36%) centers whereas 16 (64%) accepted both campus related and non-campus related children.

9. Parents were involved in policy making in 17 (68%) of the centers.

10. Staff/child ratios and the educational level of the staffs appeared to be at a satisfactory level.

11. The majority (92%) of the centers offered a wide range of educational and developmental activities for the children.

12. The majority (84%) of the centers were utilized for the training of college students.

13. Campus child care centers benefited the sponsoring institutions by offering training for employment and by making it possible for more students to attend college.

14. The primary reasons for not having a campus child care center, according to college administrators, were lack of funding and lack of suitable space or facilities.

## Discussion

The findings of the study can be compared with the findings of other studies reported in the review of literature. In tracing the historical development of the child care center movement, Frank (1962) noted that research oriented nursery schools or laboratory schools had developed in most of the major colleges and universities in the

United States by the mid thirties. The study revealed no evidence that Florida institutions were involved in that early developmental phase of the child care center movement. Data indicated that three of the universities and two of the junior colleges in the state-supported system were in existence during the 1930's. The majority (74%) of the 37 state-supported institutions in Florida were established during the twenty year period, 1958-78. All of the child care centers operating on or in relation to Florida campuses at the time of the study were reported to have been developed within the previous ten years. One (4%) of the centers indicated that its primary purpose was to serve as a research oriented program.

Young and Nelson (1973) found that the "War on Poverty" had provided the impetus for renewed interest in early childhood during the 1960's and 1970's. Federally funded programs were begun to provide children from low-income families with enriched developmental and educational experiences. In addition, it was hoped that the provision of child care would enable the low-income mother to work or train for work, thus enabling her to break out of the welfare cycle. The Journal of Home Economics (January, 1972) listed the women's rights movement, educational research, urban planning and welfare reform among the multiple factors leading to the expansion of the child care movement. Florida campus child care centers appear to have developed as a part of this renewed interest in early

childhood. All of the centers on Florida campuses were established during the late 1960's and the 1970's, the same period of time noted by Young and Nelson. In addition, the majority (56%) of the centers perceived their primary purpose to be that of providing a needed service to parents.

Florida's colleges and universities appear to be responding to the need for qualified persons to staff child care centers cited by Brown and Bige (1972). Twelve (48%) of the respondents stated that the greatest benefit of the child care center to the institution was the opportunity provided to train students for employment. Interns and students in training were reported used to supplement paid staffing in 21 (84%) of the centers. Replies seemed to support Conger (1973) who stated that two year institutions might offer courses which could be transferred to an upper level university for the degree seeking student or serve as a terminal program for the well trained para-professional. Child care centers were found to exist on 16 (48%) of the 33 junior college campuses in Florida which responded to the survey. Administrators on 12 (36%) of the junior college campuses with no center reported that courses were offered which could use a center for observation, training or research by faculty and students.

The strong interest in the development of child care centers on Florida campuses parallels the national trend cited by Potter (1972), Greenblatt (1973) and Cargill (1977). This concern was evidenced by the high rate of

return (93%) of the survey and by the unsolicited letters and informational materials which accompanied ten (23%) of the responses. The letters expressed an interest in the study and, in several instances, offered to provide the researcher with results of related studies. Six (14%) respondents requested copies of the results or wished to have an opportunity to read the completed thesis. Three respondents traced the development of centers on their campuses as evidence that a child care center was both a feasible and desirable addition to the college scene. In discussing the need for the service, one administrator stated:

> Over the years, I was discouraged to see some of our best academic talent leave school to marry and have children while the other half of the family struggled through the academic program. Young women soon learn that they must have a 'saleable skill' and that they need all of the training possible within their financial and academic ability.

One campus reported having tried a vendor type operation which failed and the college no longer had a child care center. The researcher appreciated the time and effort taken by the respondent of that institution to write details of why that particular operation had failed and the changes that could be incorporated to make this type of venture succeed. The administrator felt that a vendor operation could be a feasible alternative to total institutional support and asked that it be included in the results of the study.

The provision of child care as a means of enabling more students to attend college was seen as a benefit to the institution by eleven (44%) of the respondents. In a letter accompanying one response, an administrator stated, "In closing, let me say that I expect this service to be offered more and more by colleges since the part-time, older student is the growing 'market'."

The National Goals and Guidelines for Research in Home Economics (1970) suggested a need for research to determine the extent to which the needs of families were being met in the provision of day care facilities. This study revealed a need for both expanded and additional centers on Florida campuses if the needs of families are to be met. Being unable to serve the number of children needing and requesting services was given as the major difficulty of operating a center by three (12%) of the respondents. Only five (26%) of the 19 responses to part C of the questionnaire checked lack of need as a reason for not having a child care center on the campus.

A second need for study given in The National Goals and Guidelines for Research in Home Economics (1970) was that of evaluating current program approaches to day care for preschool children with the emphasis on the developmental needs of the child. Page (1971) also stated that groups involved in the establishment of centers needed to examine all aspects of operation and policies to insure that the quality of care would be optimal for the child as

well as a fringe benefit for the parent.

It was beyond the scope of this study to attempt judgements relating to the quality of campus child care centers in Florida. However, three components mentioned by Greenblatt and Eberhard (1973) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (1974) as being "clues" to the quality of programs were examined in the study. The components were staff/child ratio, staff training and the content of the programs offered to the children.

Although the instrument did not question the specific staff/child ratios maintained, the ratios were estimated by comparing the number of staff and volunteers, the hours of operation and the number of children served by the center. The results suggested that all centers maintained ratios within the limits advocated by the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. It can be assumed that the 14 (56%) centers licensed by either the county health departments or the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services would be required to meet those standards.

The educational level of staff members in Florida campus child care centers appeared to be comparable with the educational levels reported by Greenblatt and Eberhard (1973) in their study of campus child care centers throughout the nation. Post-graduate degrees were held by 76% of the directors and 44% of the master teachers in Florida. The national survey found that 84% of the directors and 70% of the head teachers had some post-graduate education

though they did not specify that degrees had been earned.

Responses indicated that 92% of the Florida centers offered a minimum of seven of the nine developmental and educational activities listed in the questionnaire. The majority (60%) of the centers offered health, dental and speech/hearing screening and/or care as an additional service to the children.

Four (16%) centers were obtaining reimbursements from the USDA Child Care Food Program and three (12%) received Title XX federal and state funding for eligible children. The survey did not determine whether other centers failed to utilize these resources as a matter of choice, because they were not eligible to receive them, or because they were not aware of them.

One benefit of a campus child care center, suggested by McCord (1973) was the opportunity afforded student parents to learn about child development. McCord found that centers could help to replace the support system of the extended family that may no longer be available to the student family. The National Association for the Education of Young Children suggested that parental involvement in the operation and policy making of centers was important if the center was to supplement rather than replace the child care given by the parents. The results of the study indicated that Florida campus child care centers recognized this need and have involved parents as an integral part of the centers. Parents were reported to participate in

making policy in 17 (68%) of the centers and were involved as volunteers or in co-op arrangements in ten (40%) of the centers. A large percentage (76%) of the respondents stated that opportunities were provided to develop parenting skills.

## Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made for further research:

1. A study be made to measure, compare and contrast the differences in content and operation of programs viewed as day care with those perceived by their directors to be laboratory schools or child development centers.

2. The study be replicated at intervals in order to determine the extent and direction of the development of campus child care centers in Florida.

3. Studies be conducted to determine the need and feasibility of establishing child care centers in or as an adjunct to other state agencies in Florida.

4. Develop a packet of information about resources that are being utilized by campus centers and distribute to all campuses as a means of assisting in the development and expansion of child care services.

5. Develop an instrument which could be used to measure the quality and effectiveness of child care programs.

6. Develop guidelines and instruments for use in conducting feasibility studies and needs assessments for child care centers.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

# STATE-SUPPORTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN FLORIDA

## COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

Brevard Community College*, Cocoa, also has campuses in Titusville and Melbourne. The majority of the 15,000 students are drawn from the small towns on the middle east coast of Florida. Brevard was founded in 1959.

Broward Community College is located in urban Ft. Lauderdale. Established in 1960, the college has about 14,000 students.

Central Florida Community College, Ocala, draws its 3,000 students from the rural area of central Florida. It was founded in 1957.

Chipola Junior College located in Marianna, was established in 1947. It serves approximately 1,400 students from the surrounding rural area.

Daytona Beach Junior College, founded in 1958, serves about 7,500 students. It is located in the city of Daytona Beach.

Edison Community College*, Ft. Myers, serves the small towns of Florida's lower gulf coast. The college was opened in 1961 and serves approximately 2,100 students.

Florida Junior College* has four campuses located in the city of Jacksonville. Over 18,000 students attend the college which was founded in 1965.

Florida Keys Junior College is located in the island community of Key West. Opened in 1965, the college has about 1,400 students.

Gulf Coast Community College* was established in 1957. Most of the approximately 3,000 students are from Panama City and the surrounding upper gulf coast area.

Hillsborough Junior College* is located in Tampa. The institution, founded in 1969, has three campuses. Most of its 11,000 students are drawn from the city and nearby communities.

Indian River Junior College* is in the small city of Ft. Pierce on Florida's east coast. The student body, numbering about 5,000, is drawn from the nearby semi-rural area of groves and farms. Indian River opened in 1960.

Lake City Community College features a Forest Ranger School. The student body numbers slightly under 3,000,

most of whom come from the rural area around Lake City. The institution was founded in 1962.

Lake Sumter Junior College is located in Leesburg, the heart of the grove and ranching area of Florida. Established in 1962, the college has about 1,700 students.

Manatee Junior College is located in Bradenton on Florida's populous lower gulf coast. Opened in 1957, the school has about 4,500 students.

Miami-Dade Community College* has four campuses located in the urban area of Miami. The school opened in 1959. Its 38,000 students make it one of the world's largest junior colleges.

North Florida Junior College is located in Madison and most of its 1,600 students are drawn from the surrounding farm lands. The college was founded in 1958.

Okaloosa-Walton Junior College*, founded in 1964, is located in Niceville. Most of its 3,000 students come from the area's farming, fishing and military families.

Palm Beach Junior College* is located in suburban Lake Worth. Originally opened in 1933, the institution has approximately 8,000 students.

Pasco-Hernando Junior College has about 1,000 students. It is located in Dade City in Central Florida's farming district.

Pensacola Junior College has recently opened its third campus. Opened in 1948, the college serves about 10,000 full time students and an additional 10,000 who attend college part-time.

Polk Junior College was founded in 1964 to serve the rural area surrounding Winter Haven. Approximately 4,000 students attend the college.

St. John's River Junior College is in Palatka, in rural north central Florida. About 1,400 students attend the college which was opened in 1958.

St. Petersburg Junior College has four campuses located in that urban area. Originally opened in 1927, the college serves approximately 13,000 students.

Santa Fe Community College* is located in the university city of Gainesville. The college opened in 1965 and serves about 7,000 students.

Seminole Community College* was opened in 1966. Most of the 3,500 students are from the rural area around Sanford.

South Florida Junior College* is in the small town of Avon Park in rural south central Florida. About 1,000 students attend the college which opened in 1965.

Tallahassee Community College serves the university and capitol city of Tallahassee. Founded in 1966, the college has about 3,000 students.

Valencia Junior College is in the urban area of Orlando. About 8,000 students attend the college which opened in 1967.

## UNIVERSITIES

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University is located in the city of Tallahassee. Established to serve Negro youths, in 1887, the University now draws students of both races from throughout Florida. Full four year programs and graduate studies are available. Less than 50% of the students live on campus.

Florida Atlantic University is in Boca Raton, a small town on Florida's populous lower east coast. This is an upper division university with graduate studies offered in many areas. The student body numbers over 7,000, 90% from Florida and 70% of whom are commuters. The first students were admitted in 1964.

Florida International University* is located in Miami. It offers upper division plus graduate studies. Approximately 7,500 full-time students attend this newest Florida university, opened in 1972.

Florida State University*, opened in 1857, is located in Tallahassee. The majority of its 22,000 students come from all parts of Florida. Over half of the students live off-campus. Four year bachelors, masters and doctoral programs are offered.

Florida Technological University*, located in urban Orlando, was established in 1968. There are approximately 7,500 students, 96% of them from Florida.

The University of Florida* is located in Gainesville. Founded in 1853, the University of Florida is the oldest in the state system. The institution's 27,000 students are drawn from all parts of Florida as well as other states and countries. The university offers four year, masters and doctoral programs.

The University of North Florida*, an upper division university located in urban Jacksonville, opened in 1972. The majority of the approximately 4,500 students are from Florida.

The University of South Florida* is in Tampa. Its more than 22,000 students make it one of the largest institutions in Florida's system. Established in 1956, the University offers four year programs leading to a bachelor's degree as well as masters and doctoral programs. Most of the students are from Florida; 65% live off-campus.

The University of West Florida, an upper division university also offers some masters programs. Approximately 5,000 attend the Pensacola institution, opened in 1967.

* Institutions reporting a campus child care center on or as an adjunct to one or more of its campuses.

# APPENDIX B

# CORRESPONDENCE

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Tallahassee 32304

July 9, 1977

The Women's Center
United States National Student Association
2115 S Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20008

Dear Director:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for a masters degree, I am planning a survey to determine the status of campus child care centers in the state-supported colleges and universities of Florida. Certain other information pertinent to the establishment and operation of these centers will be included in the questionnaire.

I would like permission to adapt the form DAY CARE SURVEY, used by your organization in 1971, for use in my study. I would also like to obtain a copy of the results of your survey if they are available. I have found the article "The Campus and the Day Care Movement", written by Paula Page and distributed by your organization, to be very helpful.

It is hoped that the study I conduct will yield information that will be of use to those institutions considering the establishment of campus child care centers as well as to those who have centers in existence. I shall appreciate any assistance that you can provide me.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred Holdnak
459 Osceola Hall
500 Chapel Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32304

October 7, 1977

Mrs. Ann Southerland
Department of Home Economics
Pensacola Junior College
1000 College Boulevard
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Mrs. Southerland:

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for a masters degree, I am preparing a survey to determine the status of campus child care centers in the state-supported colleges and universities of Florida. Certain other information pertinent to the establishment and operation of these centers will be included in the questionnaire.

It is necessary that I develop the instrument to be used since those available will not yield exactly the information needed. Would you consent to serve as a consultant in the development of this questionnaire? Your experience and expertise in the field of child development would be of great value to me.

I do not expect that this will require lengthy consultations. The basic questionnaire has been prepared and I am now making revisions suggested by my advisor. I would like to submit it for your critique prior to final revision. May I call for an appointment?

I shall be grateful for any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Mildred Holdnak
4849 Balmoral Drive
Pensacola, FL 32504

cc: Dr. Peggy Morrison

# United States National Student Association

Women's Desk

2115 S Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20008, (202) 265-9890

September 29, 1977

4849 Balmoral Drive
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Dear Ms. Holdnak:

Many apologies for the long delay in responding to your letter, but the women's desk has just recently begun operating again. A cursory glance at the files fails to yield the results of the survey to which you refer in your letter. However, when I get a chance to spend some time putting them in order in October, I will keep an eye peeled for that information for you.

You have our permission to adapt the form DAY CARE SURVEY, provided we are given credit for use of our work. We would also be very interested in receiving a copy of any writings which result from your work. Best of luck to you on your thesis research!

Sincerely,

Diane E. Hamlin

Diane E. Hamlin
Women's Desk

P.S. It just occurred to me that I had assumed that you have a copy of our booklet Demand for Day Care, which was put out in 1974. I have a few copies left if you don't have it. It costs only a dollar fifty plus postage. Once again, good luck to you.

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Tallahassee 32304

April 3, 1978

Dear

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for a masters degree, I am conducting a survey to determine the status of campus child care centers in the state-supported colleges and universities of Florida. The assistance of your office is requested to facilitate this study.

For purposes of the survey, a campus child care center is defined as any child care center, day care center, nursery school, laboratory school or co-op child care center located on or as an adjunct to the campus of a college or university and funded wholly or in part by that institution or its students.

Although directions for completion are given in the questionnaire, they may be summarized briefly:

Parts A & C will be completed by the chief Student Affairs officer of the institution.

Part B will be completed by the Director of the child care center if one exists.

Please return the completed questionnaire by April 20. Two self-addressed envelopes are enclosed for your convenience. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred Holdnak

Bonnie B. Greenwood, Associate Professor
College of Home Economics

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Tallahassee 32304

April 25, 1978

Dear

Your cooperation is earnestly requested to complete the survey of campus child care centers sent to your office earlier this month. The purpose of the study is to determine the existence of and the status of child care programs in or related to the state-supported colleges and universities of Florida. To compile an accurate picture, it is vitally important that I have information from each of the institutions.

If a copy of the questionnaire is needed now, please let me know. I shall be grateful for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Mildred Holdnak
4849 Balmoral Drive
Pensacola, FL 32504

# APPENDIX C

# CONSULTANTS AND

# PILOT STUDY INSTITUTIONS

## CONSULTANTS

The assistance of the following persons was helpful in developing the questionnaire:

Dr. Rosemary Layne, Dean of Student Services
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida

Mrs. Ann Southerland, Instructor in Child Development
Pensacola Junior College
Pensacola, Florida

Mrs. Virginia Christensen, Director
University of West Florida Child Care Center
University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida

## PILOT STUDY INSTITUTIONS

The University of Alabama
University, Alabama

Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

Jefferson Davis State Junior College
Brewton, Alabama

James H. Faulkner State Junior College
Bay Minette, Alabama

John C. Calhoun State Community College
Decatur, Alabama

# APPENDIX D

## STAFF-CHILD RATIOS
## FLORIDA CHILD CARE STANDARDS

## STAFF-CHILD RATIOS

Child Care Standards
Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services
1975. p.3

1. General

   a. The following staff ratio is based on direct supervision of children:

| Age of Children | Ratio |
|---|---|
| Under 1 year of age | 1 person/6 children |
| 1 year of age | 1 person/8 children |
| 2 years of age | 1 person/12 children |
| 3 years of age | 1 person/15 children |
| 4 years of age | 1 person/20 children |
| 5 years of age or older | 1 person/25 children |

   b. The groups of mixed age ranges, where infants are included, one (1) person shall not be responsible for more than six (6) children of any age group. Where infants are not included, the staff ratio shall be based on the age of the majority of children in the group.

   c. There shall be an arrangement for another adult to be readily available to substitute for the adult in charge in case of emergency.

   d. If both non-handicapped and handicapped children are served, it may be necessary for the operator to make an adjustment in the staff ratio to insure adequate and proper care of the handicapped children.

General Authority Chapter 74-113, Laws of Florida, Law Implemented, Chapter 74-113, Laws of Florida.

Adopted by Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services
July 2, 1975
Effective date July 23, 1975

# APPENDIX E

# QUESTIONNAIRE

CAMPUS CHILD CARE SURVEY

PART A - To be completed by the Dean of Student Affairs or counterpart in each institution surveyed.

1. Name of college or university_____
_____

2. Name and title of person responding_____
_____

3. If your institution has more than one campus, please indicate the campus(es) you are responding for_____
_____

4. Please check the type of institution:
   ____ Two year community junior college
   ____ Two year upper level university
   ____ Four year university
   ____ Four year university plus graduate school

5. Campus population:
   Number of full-time equivalent students _____
   Number of part-time students _____
   Number of full-time faculty/administration _____
   Number of non-faculty employees _____

6. Is there a child care center sponsored totally or in part by your institution or its students?
   ____ Yes ____ No

Please turn to PART B.

PART B - To be completed by the Director of the Campus Child Care Center. If your institution does not have a center, omit PART B and turn to PART C.

Name of the college or university_____

Name of the Child Care Center_____

1. Is the center located ____ on the campus? ____ Off campus?

2. How long has the center been in operation?_____

3. What is the maximum number of children you can accomodate at one time?_____

How many different children do you serve in an average week?_____

4. What is the age range of children accepted in your center? _____ Youngest _____ Oldest

5. Please check all of the programs that you offer:
   - ____ Full day program, regular attendance
   - ____ Half day program, regular attendance
   - ____ Drop-in care
   - ____ Before school program for school age children
   - ____ After school program for school age children
   - ____ Summer or vacation program for school age children

6. What are your hours of operation?

   _____ until _____

7. When is the center open? ____ Year round ____ When college/university is in session

8. Check all of the groups listed below that are eligible for admittance to your center. If there is a priority system, please rank them in order or priority, 1 being highest.

____ Children of full-time students
____ Children of part-time students
____ Children of faculty and administration
____ Children of non-faculty employees
____ Children of alumni
____ Non-college/university related children

9. How is your center staffed? Please check all that apply.

____ Permanent paid staff
____ Student paid staff
____ Student-in-training staff
____ Volunteers
____ Parent co-op program
____ Federally funded staff (CETA, etc.)
____ Combination of above. Please specify:_____
_____
_____

10. Number of paid staff:

____ Full-time ____ Part-time

11. What is the highest level of education completed by the Director and Head Teacher?

| | Director | Head Teacher |
|---|---|---|
| High school graduate | ____ | ____ |
| Some college | ____ | ____ |
| Graduate of four year college | ____ | ____ |
| Post-graduate degree | ____ | ____ |

12. Which of the following are provided for your center by the college or university? Check all that apply.

____ Space, free of charge
____ Space at minimal rent
____ Utilities
____ Janitorial service
____ Maintenance
____ Furnishings/equipment
____ Consumable supplies
____ Staff salaries
____ Student staffing
____ Professional assistance/consultation

13. What other in-kind services do you receive?_____

_____

_____

14. Indicate the percentage of your annual budget that is provided by:

____ Student activity fees
____ Departmental budget(s)
____ Direct appropriation from college/university
____ User fees (Please attach a fee schedule)
____ Other. Please specify:_____

_____

15. What other sources of funding do you have?

____ Title XX funds
____ USDA reimbursed food program
____ Other. Please specify:_____

_____

16. Does the college/university carry liability and/or fire insurance on the child care center?

____ Yes ____ No

17. Which of the following groups are involved in making policies of the center?

____ Administration of college/university
____ Student Government Association
____ Parents
____ Center staff
____ Faculty of one or more departments. Please specify:_____
____ Other. Please specify:_____
_____

18. Is your center licensed? ____ Yes ____ No. Please name licensing agency:_____

19. Campus child care centers may exist for one or more of the following reasons:

A - Provides needed service to parents
B - Serves college/university students as a facility for observation and training.
C - Research oriented laboratory for students/ faculty.

Which of the following best describes your center:

____ A is primary reason for center's existence.
____ B is primary reason for center's existence.
____ C is primary reason for center's existence.
____ A & B are equally important
____ A & C are equally important
____ A, B, & C are equally important

20. Which of the following services are included in your program?

____ Breakfast
____ Hot lunch
____ Naps
____ Health screening/care
____ Dental screening/care
____ Speech/hearing screening

____ Classes or opportunities for parents of children in the center to develop parenting skills.

21. Which of the following activities are a regular part of your center program?

____ Learning centers
____ Block play
____ Creative art experiences
____ Music
____ Language art activities
____ Science/nature activities
____ Swimming
____ Field trips
____ Gymnastics/tumbling
____ None of the above

22. What have you found to be the most difficult part of operating a campus child care center?_____

_____

_____

_____

23. How has the center benefited the college or university?_____

_____

_____

_____

PART C - To be completed by the Dean of Student Affairs or counterpart in those institutions that do not sponsor a child care center at this time.

1. Which of the following reasons for not sponsoring a child care center apply to your institution? (Please check all that apply. If one reason is predominant, mark it 1.)

   ____ Need for a child care center has not been indicated by students or faculty.
   ____ The college/university does not wish to compete with private operators.
   ____ No space or facilities for a center are available on the campus.
   ____ No funds are available for a center.
   ____ Concern for liability.
   ____ Trustees or governing bodies do not approve.
   ____ Investigation of the pros and cons has not been completed.
   ____ Other. Please specify:_____
   _____

2. Has your institution conducted either of the following in relation to a child care center?

   ____ Needs Assesment ____ Feasibility Study

   Would you briefly describe the findings?_____
   _____
   _____

3. Does your institution offer courses which might utilize a child care center for observation, training or research?

   ____ Yes ____ No

4. Does your institution plan to establish a child care center in the foreseeable future?

   ____ Yes ____ No ____ Undecided

# REFERENCES

REFERENCES

A look at day care services. Journal of Home Economics, 1972, 64 (1), 31.

Brown, Mary s. and Bige, B. Bethine. Survey of child development trends and practices. Journal of Home Economics, 1972, 64 (1), 41-43.

Brudenell, Gerald. Final report from the task force on child care needs at Florida State University. Gerald Brudenell, chairperson. Tallahassee, Florida, 1975.

Cargill, Grace Hernandez. Child care on campus. Young Children, 1977, 32 (2), 20-21.

Christensen, Virginia. Organization and operation of a child care center at the University of West Florida. Pensacola, Florida: University of West Florida Printing Office. 1977.

Conger, Flora. Articulation in a junior college child development program. Illinois Teacher, 1973, 17 (1) 31-36.

Congressional Quarterly, Inc. Editorial Research Reports on the Women's Movement. Hoyt Grimlin, man. ed., Washington, D.C., 1973 (August), 67.

Co-op child care center. FSU Flambeau, Tallahassee, Florida. June 28, 1974.

Day Care Center Evaluation. Community Coordinated Child Care of Tallahassee, Florida. Not dated.

Day care center is shaping up. PJC Corsair, Pensacola, Florida. October 18, 1972. 2.

Day care need examined here. PJC Corsair, Pensacola, Florida. September 27, 1972. 1.

Day care center needed on campus. PJC Corsair, Pensacola, Florida. June 2, 1977. 2.

Florida Association of Colleges and Universities. 1976 Handbook. Fort Lauderdale, Florida : Florida Association of Colleges and Universities, 1976.

Florida Board of Regents Policy 3.7.1. relating to day care centers, revised 1974. Stated in a memorandum to Dr.

Freddie Groomes from Robert D. Bickel, University Attorney, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1974.

Florida State Department of Education. Child care services: a suggested guide. Tallahassee, Florida: Home Economics Section, Florida State Department of Education. 1971.

Florida State Department of Education. Directory of Florida community colleges. Tallahassee, Florida: Division of Community Colleges, Florida State Department of Education. 1976.

Frank, Lawrence K. The beginnings of child development and family life education in the twentieth century. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 1962, 8 (4), 207-227.

Gardner, D. Bruce. Development in early childhood (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Greenblatt, Bernard and Eberhard, Lois. Children on campus: a survey of pre-kindergarten programs at institutions of higher education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1973.

Greenblatt, Bernard. Day care facts. Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, pamphlet 16 (rev.). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Hall, Calvin S. and Lindzey, Gardner. Theories of personality, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1957.

Hildebrand, Verna. Introduction to early childhood education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1971.

Hill, Jeff. Letter to President T. Felton Harrison, Pensacola Junior College, February 26, 1976.

Lehane, Stephen and Goldman, Richard. The university and day care: a new partnership. Child Welfare, 1976, 55 (2), 109-113.

McCord, Ivalee. Child care centers: a boon for campus mothers. Journal of Home Economics, 1973, 65 (4), 26-28.

National Goals and Guidelines for Research in Home

Economics, a study sponsored by the Association of Administrators of Home Economics. Jean Schlater, Director. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1970. Distributed by the American Home Economics Association, Washington, D.C.

Page, Paula. The campus and the day care movement. Women's Center, United States National Student Association. New York: Child Welfare League of America, Inc., 1971.

Potter, Winston G. Save the children. Riverside, Conn.: The Chatam Press., 1977.

Raepple, Roger. Letter stating policies of the Florida Association of Community Colleges relating to day care centers. July 5, 1977.

SGA sponsored day care center. FSU Flambeau, June 24, 1970.

Students and parents child care center. FSU Flambeau, November 12, 1973.

Some ways of distinguishing a good early childhood program. National Association for the Education of Young Children. Washington, D.C., 1974.

Stewart, Martha. A study of day care environments for children under three: what is available and what do parents want in Leon County, Florida? Unpublished master's thesis, Florida State University, 1974.

Student Senate, Pensacola Junior College, Minutes of meetings of February 17, 1971; November 19, 1975; February 18, 1976; and March 24 and 31, 1976.

Task force appointed by President Stanley Marshall to study need for day care center. FSU Flambeau, November 26, 1974.

Time for day care. PJC Corsair, March 6, 1975.

Young, Dennis R. and Nelson, Richard R. Public Policy for day care of young children. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1973.